CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXVII No. 1 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* January, 1986

WHY THE WEST FOLLOWS MARCO POLO'S TRAIL

by DON BELL

The Odd Couple met on the prepared stage at Geneva, played their parts while insisting that they were not acting. Audiences were barred during the dialogue, microphones were muted, only translators sworn to silence were present. When the play had concluded, they shook hands, issued a Joint US-Soviet Statement in which they agreed to disagree on most matters affecting the relationships of the countries they represent. Then they smiled for the cameras, said they would meet again, first in Washington then in Moscow, so they could continue to agree to disagree. But on one particular matter they were in complete agreement. The text of that Joint Statement of November 21 includes the following: "General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan reaffirmed the commitment of the USSR and the US to the Treaty on Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons . . . to pursue negotiations in good faith on matters of nuclear arms limitations." In this context, proliferation has to do with the buying, borrowing, stealing or manufacturing of nuclear weapons by countries which did not sign the Nonproliferation Treaty of 1968. Communist China is one of the countries which refused to sign the Treaty. The "limitation of proliferation" means not allowing any other nations and terrorist groups to rent, borrow or build nuclear weapons.

But even as President Reagan was agreeing to help halt the spread of such weapons to other countries, he was waiting to see if Congress would do anything to interfere with his Executive Order which allows *unlimited sale of nuclear components and technology to Communist China.* While promising to help prevent proliferation, he had agreed to give Red China anything it desired in nuclear know-how. An Executive Agreement needs no Congressional endorsement, but President Reagan was anxious to get approval of what he had done. Accordingly, *The Washington Times* of November 22 reported that "the Senate without debate and on a voice vote approved yesterday President Reagan's 30-year power agreement with the People's Republic of China, catching some of the pact's critics off guard." Columnist Stephen Chapman saw the significance of the action. He wrote in his syndicated column of November 20:

"With all eyes on the Geneva meeting on arms control between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, the administration has reached a nuclear agreement with a Communist power that may be a bigger danger to the United States than all the Soviet Union's missiles. The Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation between Washington and Peking allows American companies to build nuclear reactors in China. It lacks the usual restrictions on such exports — safeguards designed to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of countries that don't have them, thus preventing every crazy dictator on Earth from getting the means to start a nuclear war . . . On matters of nuclear proliferation, China's unreliability is amply documented. Until recently, it has actually endorsed proliferation as a blow against the United States and the Soviet Union. Worse, China reportedly has discussed nuclear exports with Iran. It has helped Pakistan in its quest for the Bomb — a programme partly financed by Libyan dictator Muammar Quaddafi, who doubtless wants one of his own. Putting nuclear weapons into the hands of any of these governments would make the world a far more dangerous place than it is today."

Emergence Of Eastasia

It is becoming obvious to students of Asian affairs that Communist China hopes to become a third partner in the Trilateral Global Programme as it was outlined in Orwell's **1984,** hopes to become the leader of the Third World in opposition to the Soviet-controlled leadership of the Eastern World and the Western World which is nominally dominated by the United States. By playing up to Iran, Pakistan, Libya and other nuclear-hungry nations, China hopes to become an "equal" in the Global Triangle. Now, just why should the United States Government assist in its own possible destruction in the business of giving away all the secrets it may have in the matter of nuclear weapons? One part of the answer is supplied by an article in **The Washington Times** of November 22:

"Proponents (of the nuclear pact with China) say it will open up the largest untapped market of the US nuclear industry and increase meagre trade rela-

tions with the world's most populous nation. The pact would allow US businessmen to bid some $6 billion in nuclear components that the Chinese need to build as many as 12 nuclear power plants by the year 2000. Competition already has begun for the trade, and France, Japan and Sweden are vying for the business. Proponents also say the United States has nothing to lose by agreeing to sell nuclear components and know-how to help China set up power plants. Since China already is a nuclear weapons state, administration officials say that the United States can only urge them not to share weapons with other nations. Congress has little chance of stopping an executive agreement which, unlike a treaty, does not require congressional approval."

So that's the bottom line: Selling nuclear secrets to Communist China is good for business! Never mind if China uses US technology to help dictators and terrorist organisations build nuclear weapons. A second reason for permitting the proliferation of nuclear technology comes to mind when we consider the current news about spies and secret agents that are causing concern to every Western nation. A report datelined Washington reads: "Senior intelligence officials say the United States has been immensely damaged by the series of espionage cases disclosed in the past week. When added to the harm caused by other major spy cases in the past six months, one senior administration official said, 'This has been an extraordinarily bad year for us.' . . . A former analyst with the CIA, Larry We-Tai Chin, arrested Saturday and accused of spying for China for more than three decades, was indicted on espionage charges . . . In addition associates interviewed yesterday said Jonathan Jay Pollard, a Navy counter-intelligence analyst who was accused last week of spying for Israel, has boasted for 10 years about working for the Israelis."

Treason Is Their Trade

Every nation has been experiencing spy trouble: Britain, France, West Germany, even the USSR. From an East European source we have a list of over 20 agents that have defected from the Soviet Union or its satellites. So intense has been the spy defections that every country has ordered a crack-down. Hence the number of arrests in the United States in the last few weeks. But, more important, note the length of time involved: Chin has been spying for Red China for more than a decade. Pollard has been spying for Israel for more than 10 years. The list can go on and on. Spies that have worked in high places in England, France, the United States, keep at their treasonable trade for years and years. If about to be exposed, they suddenly disappear and reappear in Russia or some other Communist country; or they start working for the UN Secretariat, get a bigger salary with little chance of being fired, join in with the KGB agents that infest the UN, and continue in their trade. From time to time along will come someone like Senator Joe McCarthy who will try to rid the government of its spies, and get persecuted and condemned by his own Senate colleagues because of his naming of names. There was Major Jordan who did his best to expose traitors and was ignored by those who might have done something about it. To make the people feel that all is well and national security is being maintained, a Rosenberg couple may be caught and executed, an Alger Hiss may be exposed and jailed, or a Harry Dexter White may so fear punishment that he will jump off a tall building to his death. But the Whittaker Chambers are scorned and rebuked, Senators like Pat McCarran and Robert Taft Snr. may have been murdered because they were too close to exposing such characters as Owen Lattimore, Lauchlin Currie, Mark Gains, etc. And the traitors kept on, ran to Russia, or went to work for the UN.

Our reference in all of this has to do with the Nuclear Weapons Scam. When we went into defeated Japan with General MacArthur, we managed to fly over Hiroshima and gaze down at the destruction. At that time not another country in the world had any important know-how concerning nuclear fission. German scientists had been working at the development of the atom bomb, but they had been pursuing the "hard water" principle instead of outright fission, and we won the race. But, even though there were spies at the Manhattan Project, nuclear fission was still a monopoly with the US. When we were at Bikini in July 1946 as a pool broadcaster for the four radio networks at the testing of one aerial and one under-water atomic explosion, the know-how was still a secret. Scientists in the Soviet Union hadn't the slightest idea of how to build such a bomb. The Bolsheviks had murdered all the Russian scientists. Stalin had ordered the capture of German scientists who were taken to Russia and put to work. But slaves in a foreign country are not very efficient workmen. So Russia had to depend entirely upon stealing or obtaining through official sources the components and technology required to build even a comparatively simple nuclear reactor. The United States Government co-operated to a great extent; Soviet agents and American spies made up the difference so that the Soviets actually stole or were given enough information to be first in space. Deliberately planned that way? Very probably, because the Council on Foreign Relations had taken charge of the State Department before the US actually entered World War II, and

it was (and is) the aim of the Power Elite to permit neither the USSR nor the US to get too far ahead of the other in the matter of military power. Hence the development of the Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) Programme, which is still in effect. Consider the record of the US Government as it has operated under the control of the Eastern Establishment Power Elite:

The World Bankers and Multinational Tycoons, the US Government abetting, financed the conquest of Russia for three long-range purposes. First, to provide a new trading market for American manufactures and services; second, the Communist regime co-operating, to develop natural resources, establish factories where cheap labour was plentiful and profits enormous; third, using the Hegelian Dialectical Formula familiar to both plutocrats and Communists, to develop a Socialist antithesis to combat the Private Enterprise thesis which had developed in America, this for the ultimate purpose of creating a synthesis, a Socialist One World Government. In addition, the US Government has turned its back on once-friendly Taiwan, helped destroy the Philippine government, and allowed an enemy power to take over much of Central America and the Caribbean area. It is presently in the business of destroying private enterprise in the Republic of South Africa, with the probable result that the Soviets will gain control of resources as well as vital shipping lanes. And now the US Government is opening the way for Communist China to become a great trading post for the sale of nuclear weapons to petty dictators and mad terrorists. This is to create a new market for the multinational tycoons. Never mind the potential death and destruction and misery which may arise. "For the love of money . . ."

Don Bell edits a fortnightly newsletter, "Don Bell Reports". For a sample copy, please send one pound to Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, United States of America.

Read

SPEARHEAD

Edited by John Tyndall

Send 63p for a sample copy to:

P.O. BOX 446, LONDON SE23 2LS.

BULLS IN THE ORIENT

US Government and Big Business are not alone in paving the way to Peking. Lord Young, who is Mrs. Thatcher's employment spokesman, flew to China at the end of the year — his second visit there in 1985 — in the hope of securing orders for British telecommunications and electronics products, backed by Government promises to subsidise loans to the tune of £100 million. As the journal **Action** remarked, what this will really amount to is that "a few British firms will win contracts, but a lot more firms will be put out of business and their workers will lose jobs when the Chinese use British know-how to capture British markets in the future."

About the same time, another businessman was heard expounding his views about the future of Hong Kong on Radio Four's **Today** programme. He said he "didn't think a Western-style democracy would be suitable for the colony" as he had every confidence in the goodwill of China to administer Hong Kong following its hand-over to the Communists in 1997. Of course, he added, his comments had nothing at all to do with the lucrative contracts in mainland China for which British business is hoping. A likely story! As **Candour** noted in July 1978 (*vide* "The Bull's in the China Shop"), "when everybody's up the Marco Polo trail, we should not ignore the signs."

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID

I am sure that many **Candour** readers must be as irritated as I am by this fatuous Committee and its self-important "black list" of sportsmen who have performed in South Africa.

The "black list" is, in fact, becoming a farce and quite unworkable. This pestilential Committee can be destroyed if it is inundated with requests to be placed on the "black list".

May I venture to suggest, therefore, that any readers who have played any game, be it only a game of darts over a sundowner, should write to the Committee, explain what they have done and demand to be placed on the list. The address is:

The United Nations Special Committee Against Apartheid,
United Nations Plaza,
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.

I cannot think of a more amusing or more worthy way of using a postage stamp.

NOEL HUNT.

ULSTER'S BETRAYAL

It is almost beyond belief that anyone could think that the Thatcher-Fitzgerald "peace and reconciliation" pact will actually result in that. On the day the Anglo-Irish agreement was signed, both brands of Ulster Unionist — Official and Paisleyite — condemned it; the Sinn Feiners condemned it; the (very big) opposition in the Dublin Parliament condemned it. All did so in no uncertain terms. The IRA didn't need to speak words: that very day they chose to explode a bomb killing one man and causing serious injury to several (and, no doubt, they had hoped for more). Not a lot of reconciliation there — more a case of incitement to the reverse!

How can it ever be possible to share power within a political institution with those who deny its legitimacy and whose sole aim is its destruction? The Anglo-Irish agreement will fail for the same reason as all the other pipe-dreams of unity. It is an attempt to reconcile two irreconcilable interests: Ulster Unionism and Irish Republicanism (*not* Protestantism and Roman Catholicism). The conflict is not religious, but political.

Yet learning nothing from Ulster's troubled history, Mrs. Thatcher has agreed with the government of a (legally) foreign country that it shall have a function in formulating the policy and laws which will apply to British citizens living in an integral part of the United Kingdom. The future agenda of the Anglo-Irish government conference will include the reorganisation of the security forces and the composition of courts to include judges from the Irish Republic. If this is not an interference with the principle of national sovereignty, it is difficult to conceive (EEC membership apart) what might be.

If any Unionists doubt the Government's intentions — the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland has repeatedly said it is only the elected representatives of the majority who are opposed to the agreement, and not the bulk of the people — they should recall the words of Sir William Harcourt: "The Conservatives, mark my word, never yet took up a cause without betraying it in the end."

WOT? NO RACIST ATTACK?

"A man who appeared at Waltham Forest Court charged with setting fire to his own home, was bailed until December 19. Sohail Ghani, 23, of St. Mary's Road, Walthamstow, is accused of arson with intent to endanger the life of his 23-year-old wife, Shaheen. The fire occurred on October 9 at premises which had once been a shop."

— **Waltham Forest Yellow Advertiser,** 6/12/85.

ARE SOME MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS THEN?

As soon as one of our alert subscribers heard that *Younger* was to replace *Heseltine,* he guessed correctly that *Younger's* successor would be the genuine Clansman with the nut brown voice. As this, as he says, increases the number of Red Sea pedestrians in the Cabinet to 5 (at least), HE "ran my little computer programme with the new figures". Our readers will be interested in the results.

We are frequently reminded nowadays that all races are equal and that none is more equal than others. It follows therefore that the racial mix of such groups of excellence as the Cabinet should follow the natural laws of probability reasonably closely.

Jewish sources give the percentage of Jews in the population of these democratic isles as about 7/10 of 1%m (7 per 1,000). Taking the number of persons in the Cabinet as 25 (including the First Lady herself) and applying the binomial theorem of probabilities we can calculate the odds of finding as many as 5 Jews as a sample of 25 persons chosen at random from our population. My calculations show that the odds are well over a MILLION TO ONE against!

The full results of the group of 25 are odds against finding as many as one Jew equals 5 to 1 against. Odds against finding 2 Jews 75 to 1 against; 3 Jews to 1,500 to 1 against; 4 Jews to 40,000 to 1 against; 5 Jews to 1¼ million to 1 against.

A figure of 21 was quoted on the TV lately as the size of the Cabinet. If this is correct and it includes 5 Jews the odds against are well over 3 million to 1. So much for the practical application of equality.

SECULARISING THE SOUTH

"The question what would happen, supposing that by some miracle Partition were to be abolished tomorrow and Orangemen from Belfast came storming down into the Dail . . . It is obvious that these Orange members would wholly change the Pattern of Irish politics and Irish legislation. The notion that . . . the South could go on with the North, exactly as it had gone on in the years before without the North, is an absurdity. The Orangemen clearly would not tolerate present legislation on divorce or contraception . . . and this demand for change would come from the younger generation which is thoroughly weary of the sectarian politics of the North but equally unwilling to accept the Church-inspired discipline* of the South."

* *Or what's left of it post-Vatican II — Editor.*

— Christopher Hollis, **Along The Road To Frome.**

GANDHI - AN UNSENTIMENTAL ESTIMATE

by A. K. CHESTERTON

This Christmas saw on BBC 1 the first (of undoubtedly many) TV broadcasts of Richard Attenborough's adoring epic, **Gandhi.** The **Radio Times** previewed the cinematic extravaganza as a "throwback to times when films regularly made entertainment out of history". Would it not be more accurate to describe **Gandhi** as an essay in deification out of fantastic legend? Below is a more dispassionate appraisal than Attenborough's of the fraudulent lawyer, politician and saint, originally published in**London Tidings** in February 1948. — *Editor.*

The emotional depths which the death of Mr. Gandhi sounded in the British people was surprising. Apart from natural abhorrence at the "deep damnation of his taking off," there was everywhere a genuine feeling of loss, not merely because of the passing from our sublunary scene of a long-established "character" whose semi-nude figure offered scope to the cartoonists as it was drawn hither and thither in a high-powered car — in the stress of the occasion that comic aspect was quite forgotten — but because the figure had come to be regarded as the earthly home of a more than earthly spirit, the mortal abode of one of the rare celestial beings who have walked the earth in human guise. Understandable in India, as in many other parts of Asia, the phenomenon was astonishing in Britain for the simple reason that the existence in one man of the disparate qualities which make up a lawyer, a politician and a saint suggests a combination unlikely, one would have thought, to commend itself to the credulity — or, what is perhaps much the same thing, to the sense of congruity — of our own people. Yet the miracle undoubtedly happened. Bank clerks, artisans, doctors, merchants, labourers — all were heard to speak in hushed tones of the event, as though a soul of whitest radiance had fled the earth, to the impoverishment of mankind.

It might be as well if the reader who unreservedly shared this popular and by no means ignoble emotion were to skip the present article, because it so happened that the writer of it was left high and dry by the great tidal wave of feeling which news of the assassination flung across the world. Let me confess that while I was moved, it was not because of any awareness that a god had been slain, but because of a keen sense of the irony that an exceedingly fallible mortal like Mr. Gandhi, preaching an altogether erroneous doctrine, should have met his death in a way which so vividly demonstrated that same personal fallibility and that precise doctrinal error. I am willing to believe that the manner of his death was the perfect seal wherewith to stamp for posterity the tremendous Gandhi myth, but when I am asked to believe that either the life or the death of this most remarkable man held anything but practical ill for the teeming masses of his fellow-countrymen I simply cannot do it. While I am not blind to his towering spiritual stature, what fills me with awe when my thoughts dwell upon Mr. Gandhi is not the vastness of the magnetic field created by his personality, but his sheer, galloping irresponsibility, together with his culpably misplaced confidence in his own power to allay the cruel disorders which his policies created, and which — had he troubled to think about it — they could not, in the circumstances of their time and place, have failed to create.

Ends And Means

Hitler and Gandhi, if they cannot be compared, can at least be contrasted, for whereas Hitler held that the end justified the means, Gandhi must obviously have persuaded himself that the means could shape the end. Both notions are aspects of the one cardinal political error — the error of supposing that the constantly shifting kaleidoscope of human affairs will ever allow a political end to be precisely predetermined or thereafter permanently fixed. Were the contrary to be true there would be little sense in the saw about the road to hell being paved with good intentions. The good intentions would all be translated into good deeds. As, however, the people are as little aware of the workings of cause and effect as the beblinkered idealists who aspire to lead them it becomes possible for a man to be worshipped as a god — Gandhi, Hitler, Stalin, Ataturk, Mussolini, even the war-time Churchill — whereas the totality of that man's policy may be such that the more suitable method of dealing with him would be to lock him up as a public menace. The same thought must often have occurred, in the deep silence of the night, to the great men themselves, in as far as mighty wielders of power are ever capable of objective thinking. Mr. Gandhi, the evidence would lead one to suppose, was not an objective thinker.

The contradictions amidst which the Indian leader dwelt were unconsciously etched by the British Prime Minister in his wireless tribute. Mr. Attlee in one and the same breath depicted Mr. Gandhi as both the priest of Indian nationalism and as the prophet recoiling before the impact of the West. Both pictures

were true, which is a faithful pointer to the confusion at the heart of the Gandhi philosophy. It is understandable that a brooding Eastern mind should reject the dynamism of Western civilisation and seek against its encroachment to insulate the distinctive Eastern values, but it is starkly incomprehensible that any mind in working order should try to create that insulation by importing from the West the great dynamic of modern nationalism. The British Raj, admittedly, was a constant reminder of the presence in the East of Western influence, but it was an influence on the highest plane, representing order, justice, an honest administration, peaceful trade, and a very high code of personal conduct. It was frustrating only to those Indians who themselves wished to take the West as their exemplar and so destroy the immemorial way of life which Mr. Gandhi was apparently so anxious to preserve and judiciously reform. In other words, the British system in India was an ideal protective device in the shelter of which the East could have continued to be Eastern and enjoyed in tranquility the cultivation of its own soul. By getting rid of the British, a task to which he devoted many years of his life, and at the same time by accepting Western nationalist concepts, Mr. Gandhi did not expel Western influences, but merely exchanged the highest influence, based on the ideal of service, for the lowest influence, consisting of a catch-penny demagogy destined to suffer further debasement, and to become still more febrile, at the instance of *babu* practitioners. The result can only be rampant spiritual bastardy.

Had Mr. Gandhi been a man of authentic greatness he would assuredly have recognised this truth and sought the fulfilment of his ideals within the framework of the admirable British system. He did nothing of the kind. He doled out to his followers precisely the kind of claptrap by means of which the Shinwells and all the other tripe-merchants of the West (or relative West!) try to curry favour with the masses. He told them that once the British had been ejected, human misery would be banished for ever, and India from one end to the other would pulse with a radiant happiness. Such speeches of his are on record. Either he believed his own pernicious nonsense or he did not believe it. If he believed it, if he thought that the means could really shape the end, then his gullibility was truly monumental and defies all further comment. If he did not believe it, but held that the end justified the means, however dubious, then we are entitled to ask what else contributed to those particular means. Were his fasts, his ascetic practices, his implied professions of sanctity, all part of a technique for gaining power over the hearts of his people? Did he derive from the mass worship which was increasingly accorded him that fierce personal exultation which is sometimes experienced by superb orators when they know that the emotions of their audiences are theirs utterly to command? These questions express doubt, and are not rhetorical in the sense of implying an affirmative answer. But if the answers should happen to be "yes" they would confirm the scepticism of those of us who find difficulty in accepting in one person — whether that person be Gandhi or our own estimable Stafford Cripps — the combined qualities of lawyer, politician and saint.

Communal Passion

The arguments advanced up to this point would still be valid, with respectful submission, even if there did not exist in India a cleavage as near to being fundamental as any in history — the abysmal cleavage between Hindu and Moslem. Should Mr. Gandhi really have supposed that love would build a bridge over this abyss, the thought was one which reflected more upon the kindness of his kind heart than upon his sense of human realities. No sooner was his great objective obtained — the transfer of power from British hands, which alone were capable of keeping the murderous impulses of the communal conflict under restraint — than the lid blew off the powder magazine, scattering far and wide the puny new custodians of law and order, without in any way deflating their pompous sense of self-importance. Scores of thousands of men, women and children were butchered. Thousands of women and children were outraged. Millions of people were uprooted from their homes and made destitute. This was the realisation of Mr. Gandhi's brave new Indian world which he had painted in such very different colours. All that he could do was to "fast unto death" in Calcutta, to put a stop to Moslem retaliation in that city. Such was his prestige that in this limited objective he succeeded, but that brought no consolation to the myriads who mourned for those who had already perished. Thereafter he undertook another "fast unto death" (again without dying) on behalf of better relations between India and Pakistan, bringing it arbitrarily to an end without those relations having undergone any appreciable change. Is it possible that there was a substantial element of the meretricious in all such proceedings? The question is not asked because of any desire to sneer at Mr. Gandhi. Very far from it. But if human affairs are ever to be sanely conducted it is first essential that at least a few people should endeavour to distinguish the true from the false, and examine both leaders and policies as far as possible without the emotional discolour-

ation which drives forth sanity and institutes the antic reign of unreason.

The basic error in Gandhi's philosophy may well have been his pacifism. He who would be truly a pacifist must die at birth. Otherwise his avoidance of violence can be only partial. Even to breathe is to destroy living organisms. In the same way, passive resistance must also be relative. There will always be some beings who are less passive than others. No man, however great his virtue or however immense his influence, can rationally hope, when conducting a large campaign involving millions of human beings to lay down an immutable and valid line between what is impermissible in civil disobedience and what other minds may regard as eminently permissible. It is not greatness to evade such issues, but irresponsible childishness. Some might even call it a sign of megalomania. In the same way, it was childish of Mr. Gandhi to suppose that he or his ideals could contain within bounds the fire of Indian nationalism which he was largely responsible for setting alight. He gave his life inadvertently to establish this truth, for what was his murderer but a creation of the impulses which he had set in motion?

Gandhi was a very remarkable human being. May he rest in peace! It is unlikely, however, that the India of his making is destined to rest in peace. More likely is it that she will be plunged into chaos without precedent, and in the process become livid with a corruption born of the most depraved features of East and West in unnatural conjugation. The one hope of avoiding this fate lies in the emergence of a real leader who has no need of either homespun or fasting, but whose strength, patriotism and clarity of mind impel him to persuade the British to return and thus save the soul and mind and body of India, which otherwise would be destroyed by those raging monsters of hatred against which Gandhi's love could have prevailed had it sought common sense as its companion.

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum	
U.K. - - -	£5.00	
Overseas - -	£6.00	Airmail
U.S. Dollar Rate -	$10.00	,,

FOREST HOUSE. LISS FOREST. HANTS GU33 7DD

SOLZHENITSYN'S "ANTI-SEMITISM"

(from **The Daily Telegraph**, 15/11/85

"Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the reclusive Nobel Prize-winning novelist, is at the centre of an unusual literary row over claims that his work shows signs of anti-semitism . . .

"While well-known Jewish intellectuals have defended Solzhenitsyn from charges of anti-semitism, other respected scholars claim the writer has a tendency to 'blame the Jews for the Russian Revolution'. Questions about Solzhenitsyn's attitude to the Jews have been raised in academic circles for more than a decade, but the debate recently acquired fresh impetus with the publication of an expanded version of his novel, **August 1914.**

"The new version, which has so far been issued only in French and German, includes a section on the 1911 assassination of the Russian Prime Minister, Peter Stolypin, by Dmitri Begrov, an anarchist Jew. According to Prof. Richard Pipes, a Soviet specialist at Harvard University and one of the Russian author's most formidable critics, Solzhenitsyn portrays Stolypin's assassin as a Jew seeking to protect Jewish interests. Prof. Pipes says the real Begrov was a renegade whose Jewishness was incidental. 'Solzhenitsyn is unquestionably in the grip of the Russian extreme Right's view of the revolution, which is that it was the doing of the Jews'."

Fierce Defence

"The debate took an unexpected twist this week when the **New York Times** published extracts from letters Solzhenitsyn wrote to one of the newspaper's reporters. 'Concerning the label "anti-Semitism" this word, just as other labels as well, has lost its precise meaning from thoughtless use,' Solzhenitsyn wrote. 'To approach a literary work with the measuring stick of "anti-Semitism" is vulgar, an under-developed understanding of the nature of a literary work. By this measuring stick Shakespeare could be proclaimed "anti-Semitic" and his creative work struck out'."

"Prof. Adam Ulam, of Harvard University, one of many eminent academics prepared to defend Solzhenitsyn, acknowledged to the **Times** that the author's depiction of the Stolypin assassination did 'lend itself' to an anti-semitic interpretation. But he added: 'On balance, taking into account all his work and his entire biography, I don't think you can call Alexander Solzhenitsyn an anti-Semite. He has a very sharp pen. I admit. He's extremely passionate. He's said some sharp things about Jews. But he has sharp things to say about Russians who are not Jews. The most you might say about Solzhenitsyn is that he resents the intrusion of foreign influences into Russian life'."

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Useful Shopping List

One of the Anti-Apartheid outfit's shaggy shufflers shoved a leaflet into my hand when I was monitoring its demo in London on November 2nd. The tatty screed urged readers to "help the black people of South Africa" by boycotting the following products of that country: Cape and Outspan fresh fruit; canned and dried fruit with the labels Koo, Del Monte, S & B, Silver Leaf, Gold Reef, John West, Sharwoods and Gants; Armour and Bull Brand tinned meats; Happy Pet pet food; Rooibosch health tea; Country Casuals, Miss Cassidy and Pat Shub labelled textiles and clothes; the Creative Stationery range; shoes marketed under the brand name Carvela; and cooking tins such as Pointer, Harvest Gold and Silver tar. I believe in helping *my* kinfolk in South Africa, and I know you do too. So go and buy these products whenever possible!

Nowhere Left To Run?

That said, I'm beginning to wonder just how unthinkable *is* the prospect of White capitulation in South Africa. Ivor Benson reckons the situation is very different from Rhodesia. He says in **Behind The News:** "The Rhodesians were fewer and had the whole of the English-speaking world as a possible haven of refuge. Not so the bulk of the Afrikaners." However, **Spearhead,** while hoping South Africa won't go down, nevertheless feels "there are no refugees to this country we would rather have" than South Africans of British descent. But would all of them be quite the asset they seem? Having voted in Rhodesia and now in the Republic for politicians determined to surrender gradually to Black rule, doesn't their form suggest they would reject, rather than advocate, resistance *here* when the going gets 'blacker'?

When Right Is Wrong

I can think of lots of reasons to scorn the idea of a Channel Tunnel. It strikes a strategic blow at the inviolability of our island (although a few sticks of dynamite attached to a time fuse would soon block the under-water march of an invader). It will facilitate still further the "cultural exchange" with the Continent of things rough and nasty, like Peugot cars and English soccer hooligans. It also poses the question of precisely where the change-over of sides for driving will take place. In France? Half-way across the Channel? On the White Cliffs of Dover? More likely, completion of the 'Chunnel' will be taken as an excuse to 'harmonise' Euro-highway codes with a Commission directive for Britons to drive on the right (and wrong!) side. Neither Sikhs nor Dr. Kitty Little will get out of it. And we shall become even less ourselves and more part of an undifferentiated Cosmopolis to say nothing of the "incidental" tax payers' expense.

Tout For Nout

I detected a very sharp emphasis at the Confederation of British Industry's Harrogate conference on cutting pay rises to make industry more competitive. "Nowt for nowt" was the slogan coined by Sir Terence Beckett, the CBI's director-general, to help phase out annual inflation-related rises. Nowt at all was said by him about his suggestions for phasing out the usurous system of finance that feeds wage *and* price inflation. Also, I didn't observe a flicker of embarrassment among Britain's top managers at Becketts words in view of their own extravagent pay rises — they averaged 17 per cent in 1985! Evidently, there's little drive for restraint in the boardroom compared to the shopfloor. In consistency and example, the CBI's members have a very long way to go.

CALLED TO THE BAR

Main-chancers and charlatans
Such men — and women too —
Sycophants and simpletons,
The Euro-M.P. stew.

Band-waggoners and bandits,
But equivocally,
The Yes-Men with their plaudits
For con of V.A.T.

When mini-minds forgather
Trivia is in spate,
The Scots would call it 'blether',
In Brussels 'tis 'debate'.

The bottom of the barrel
They scrape to the last bit;
The subject is the humble
Bar of milk choc-a-lit.

Thinking their own condition —
So close does it relate —
Auto-suggest 'Perdition'
With chocolate — 'Vegitate'.

B. E. BIGGS.

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co Ltd.